5th February 1934]

District boards and taluk boards working at a deficit.

* 611 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of the district boards which are working at a deficit and the amount of deficit in the last budget of each of them; and

(*b*) the names of taluk boards which have recurring deficits and those which are on the border line?

A.—(*a*) Particulars are furnished in Annexure I.[a]

(*b*) Particulars are furnished in Annexure II.[a]

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"How have Government met the deficits of several districts like Trichinopoly?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—"It is for the district boards to devise ways and means."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Have the Government approved the deficit budgets or insisted that their budgets should be balanced?"

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—"In some cases Government have done so."

District boards working at a deficit.

* 612 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many and which of the district boards are working at a deficit at present;

(*b*) what action the Government propose to take to remedy this defect; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the revenues of the district boards have decreased owing to the abolition of tolls?

A.—(*a*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 611.

(*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the Press Communiqué, dated 6th January 1934, regarding the abolition of taluk boards. The Government's proposals are contained in Bill No. 2 of 1934. It is also proposed to introduce a Bill providing for the imposition of tolls on non-motor vehicles and animals.

(*c*) The answer is in the affirmative.

Taluk boards working on a deficit both prior to and after the Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930.

* 613 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many and which of the taluk boards which were in existence before the Local Boards Act, 1930, were working at a deficit;

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 519–520 infra.

[5th February 1934

(b) how many and which of the present taluk boards are working at a deficit; and

(c) what action the Government propose to take to remedy these defects?

A.—(a) Particulars are furnished in the annexure.[a]

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (b) of question No. 611.

(c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the Press Communiqué, dated 6th January 1934, regarding the abolition of taluk boards. The Government's proposals are contained in Bill No. 2 of 1934.

Taluk boards and their finances prior to bifurcation.

* 614 Q.—Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the total number of taluk boards in this Presidency;

(b) how many of them are self-supporting; and

(c) how many taluk boards were financially low prior to every taluk being bifurcated into a taluk board?

A.—(a) 208.

(b) 79.

(c) Out of 130 taluk boards in 1930–31 as many as 46 taluk boards were unable to make their receipts cover their expenditure. Since then, the finances of taluk boards have been adversely affected not only by the bifurcation but also by the fact that taluk boards which had been levying an optional land-cess of not more than 3 pies in addition to the 6 pies cess, lost the income from such optional land-cess in panchayat areas under the **Madras** Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1930.

Appointment and pay of district panchayat officers.

* 615 Q.—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether district panchayat officers have been appointed in all districts; and

(b) whether their pay is met from the general funds of the board or from the Village Development Fund?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (a) of question No. 570.

(b) The Government have permitted district boards to debit the pay only of the district panchayat officer to the Village Development Fund with the concurrence of the Village Development Fund Committee, if it is not possible to meet the expenditure from the general funds of the district boards.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 521 infra.